

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WYNDHOLME VILLAGE, LLC, et al.	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL NO. L-01-3809
	:	
NADIF OF WYNDHOLME, LLC, et al.	:	

ORDER

Pending are numerous motions filed by Plaintiffs. The Court hereby rules as follows:

- (i) Plaintiffs' Motion to Reconsider (Docket No. 47) is GRANTED;
- (ii) Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Stuart Fisher to Answer Interrogatories and Appear for His Deposition (Docket No. 45) is GRANTED as unopposed.¹ Specifically, the Court rules as follows:
 - (a) on or before June 27th, 2003, Mr. Fisher shall answer the three sets of interrogatories previously propounded by Plaintiffs, and
 - (b) Mr. Fisher shall submit to a deposition, to be taken at the time and location chosen by Plaintiffs, subject to the deadlines described below;
- (iii) Plaintiffs' Motion for Discovery Pursuant to Local Rule 104.8 (Docket No. 49) is DENIED as MOOT;
- (iv) Plaintiffs' Motion for an Extension of Discovery Deadlines (Docket No. 52) is GRANTED in PART and DENIED in PART, as follows:
 - (a) July 16th is the deadline for discovery,
 - (b) July 22nd is the deadline for requests for admissions, and

¹The Court notes that there are three sets of interrogatories. Under the Federal Rules, a party is normally allowed one set per opposing party, which, including subparts, cannot exceed 25 in number. Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a). Because Mr. Fisher did not oppose the motion to compel, the Court does not have his views on whether these limitations have been exceeded.

- (c) August 11th is the dispositive motions deadline; and
- (v) Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint (Docket No. 51) is GRANTED. Although untimely, Plaintiffs' amendments do not alter the substantive allegations contained in the original complaint. Rather, the amendments set forth additional causes of action, the propriety of which can be tested by a motion for summary judgment.

It is so ORDERED this 16th day of June, 2003.

_____/s/_____
Benson Everett Legg
Chief Judge